

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified patent application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are in this case. Claims 17 and 20 have been rejected under § 112, first paragraph. Claims 17 and 20 have been rejected under § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-20 have been rejected under § 102(b). Claims 1-20 have been rejected under § 103(a). Dependent claims 15-20 have been canceled. Independent claims 1 and 6 have been amended.

The claims before the Examiner are directed toward a system in which a multiplicity of diverse dedicated hardware off-core execution units are connected to, but logically separate from, a core processor in order to increase the speed, power and flexibility of the processor, and a method of operating the system. Reference instructions executed by the core processor initiate the execution of Configurable Long Instruction Word (CLIW) instructions stored in a CLIW memory. The operation of the off-core execution units is controlled by CLIW instructions. These CLIW instructions may also control operations performed by the core processor, and may be in addition to any other CLIW instructions that control the core processor exclusively. The off-core logic units are operationally connected to the data memory of the core processor under the control of the core processor's data address logic. The use of CLIW technology for the control of the off-core hardware logic units allows the addition of a plurality of diverse off-core logic units without affecting the instruction set, coding space, or instruction decoders of the core processor.

### **§ 112, First Paragraph Rejections**

The Examiner has rejected claims 17 and 20 under § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 17 and 20 now have been canceled, thereby rendering moot the Examiner's rejection of these claims.

### **§ 112, Second Paragraph Rejections**

The Examiner has rejected claims 17 and 20 under § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

### **§ 102(b) and § 103(a) Rejections – Lavi et al. '922**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lavi et al., WO 99/42922 (henceforth, "Lavi et al. '922") or, in the alternative, as obvious over Lavi et al. '922. The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.


Claims 15-20 have been canceled, thereby rendering moot the Examiner's rejection of these claims.

The Examiner has kindly suggested overcoming the rejection based on Lavi et al. '922 by amending independent claims 1 and 6 to define the off-core execution units as "external off-core processing units connected to a core processor in an interchangeable and selectable manner by means of an interface" Independent claim 1 and 6 now have been so amended.

With independent claims 1 and 6 allowable over the cited prior art in their present form, it follows that claims 2-5 and 7-14, that depend therefrom, also are allowable.

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 6, and hence dependent claims 2-5 and 7-14 are in condition for allowance. Prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Mark M. Friedman  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 33,883

Date: May 31, 2005